IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

THURSDAY, THE 31ST MAY 2007 / 10TH JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 16544 of 2007(T)

PETITIONER:

N.VIJAYAN, MANAGER,
CHITRANJALI STUDIO, CHERTHALA.

BY ADV. SRI.B.S.SWATHY KUMAR.

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. **KERALA STATE FILM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.**
2. **T.P.LALAN, MAINTENANCE ENGINEER (ELECTRONIC), KERALA STATE FILM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, ENQUIRY OFFICER.**

BY

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 31/05/2007,THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

W.P.(C) NO. 16544 OF 2007-T

JUDGMENT

The petitioner challenges Exts.P8, P9 and P10. Ext.P8 is a show cause notice issued by the disciplinary authority to the petitioner. Ext.P9 is an enquiry report, based on which Ext.P8 is issued. Ext.P10 is a supplementary report. The petitioner attacks Ext.P9 enquiry report on various grounds and challenges the further proceedings initiated, based on it. But, at this stage, the challenge against Exts.P8 to P10 is premature. The petitioner may offer his explanation to Ext.P8. In that he can attack the enquiry report, by taking all grounds available under law. If his explanation is brushed aside and some punishment is imposed, then only the petitioner can be said to be aggrieved. While challenging the order imposing punishment, the petitioner can attack the adverse enquiry report also.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the time for submitting reply to the show cause notice will expire soon. The petitioner may require some more time. If that be so, he may make a request to the disciplinary authority for further time to submit his explanation.

Subject to the above observation, the writ petition is dismissed without prejudice to the contentions of the petitioner.

31st May, 2007. K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, JUDGE.

Nm/